

M00263.AR.000504
MCRD PARRIS ISLAND
5090.3a

EMAIL REGARDING U S EPA REGION IV COMMENTS ON DRAFT PROPOSED PLAN FOR
A FINAL REMEDY AT SITE 3 CAUSEWAY LANDFILL MCRD PARRIS ISLAND SC

9/26/2007

U S EPA REGION IV

From: Koroma-Llamas.Lila@epamail.epa.gov
To: charles.cook2@navy.mil; art.sanford@navy.mil; koroma-llamas.lila@epa.gov; [Sladic, Mark](mailto:Sladic,Mark); kraemer@tampabay.rr.com; mmcrae@TechLawInc.com; wendtp@dnr.sc.gov; tom.dillon@noaa.gov; timothy.j.harrington@usmc.mil; AmickMS@dhec.sc.gov; darrel.pittman@usmc.mil; bowersjb@dhec.sc.gov
Subject: Final Mailed Version OU3 PP EPA comments and cover letter
Date: Wednesday, September 26, 2007 3:14:13 PM
Attachments: [Scan001.PDF](#)
[Site 3 PP EPA CvrLtr & Comments-Sep07.doc](#)

Hi Folks,

Here's the final version as is going in the mail. The only thing that changed was the format really. The opening language went into the cover letter, and one line of language moved from the last line of General Comment #3 up a couple of lines. The attached adobe version has my signature. The Word version is for use in RTCs.

Please note that my cover letter says that most of the comments do not need extensive responses nor do they need to include exact replacement language, since we are doing a D1 rev 2. In fact, As I suggested to Charles this morning, the RTCs for most of these can just say "Accepted" or if there is not even anything really to "accept", you can say "Comment acknowledge, PP will be revised accordingly" and leave it at that. Do not try to put specific replacement language in for all those reorg type comments. The few comments that will need a more extensive response would be:

* The gw monitoring issue - Could be as simple as "Accepted" to as extensive as a full length argument back that says you desire to discuss this further and here is why.....

* The sw question - Could be as simple as, "Here's the straightforward language that was in the RI and IROD that clearly articulates what is needed for SW...." (meaning EPA just missed it) to "Here is information compiled from various sections of the RI and IROD that, when viewed as a whole, now clearly presents what is needed for SW...."

* The Administrative Record - Could be as simple as "Accepted" to a slightly more detailed answer that says what your preferred path forward is.

Outside of that, there are a couple of questions that need some bit of response like the one regarding enforcement of LUCs and the LUC/Site Boundary lines.

I may have missed something, but I believe that covers most of it with respect to RTCs. But this is your call. You go as detailed as you feel is necessary. I just wanted to clarify for you as to what level of detail we would require/expect.

(See attached file: Scan001.PDF)(See attached file: Site 3 PP EPA CvrLtr & Comments-Sep07.doc)